



Development of Comparative Toxicity Potentials of TiO₂ Nanoparticles for Use in Life Cycle Assessment

Ettrup, Kim; Kounina, Anna; Hansen, Steffen Foss; Meesters, Johannes A J; Blikra Veia, Eldbjørg; Laurent, Alexis

Published in:
Environmental Science and Technology

Link to article, DOI:
[10.1021/acs.est.6b05049](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b05049)

Publication date:
2017

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):
Ettrup, K., Kounina, A., Hansen, S. F., Meesters, J. A. J., Blikra Veia, E., & Laurent, A. (2017). Development of Comparative Toxicity Potentials of TiO₂ Nanoparticles for Use in Life Cycle Assessment. *Environmental Science and Technology*, 51(7), 4027-4037. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b05049>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Development of comparative toxicity potentials of TiO₂ nanoparticles for use in life cycle assessment

Kim Ettrup¹, Anna Kounina², Steffen Foss Hansen³,
Johannes A. J. Meesters⁴, Eldbjørg B. Veia¹, Alexis Laurent^{1*}

¹ Division for Quantitative Sustainability Assessment (QSA), Department of Management Engineering, Technical University of Denmark, Bygningstorvet 116B, 2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark

² Quantis, EPFL Innovation Park, Bât D, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

³ Department of Environmental Engineering, Technical University of Denmark, Building 115, 2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark


⁴ Institute for Water and Wetland Research, Department of Environmental Science, Radboud University Nijmegen, P.O. Box 9010, NL-6500 GL Nijmegen, The Netherlands

* To whom correspondence should be addressed; E-mail: alau@dtu.dk, Tel.: (+45) 45 25 44 23

Abstract

Studies have shown that releases of nanoparticles may take place through the life cycle of products embedding nanomaterials, thus resulting in potential impacts on ecosystems and human health. While several life cycle assessment (LCA) studies have assessed such products, only a few of them have quantitatively addressed the toxic impacts caused by released nanoparticles, thus leading to potential biases in their conclusions. Here, we address this gap and aim to provide a framework for calculating comparative toxicity potentials (CTP) for nanoparticles and derive CTP values for TiO₂ nanoparticles (TiO₂-NP) for use in LCA. We adapted the USEtox 2.0 consensus model to integrate the SimpleBox4Nano fate model, and we populated the resulting model with TiO₂-NP specific data. We thus calculated CTP values for TiO₂ nanoparticles for air, water and soil emission compartments for freshwater ecotoxicity and human toxicity, both cancer effects and non-cancer effects. Our results appeared plausible after benchmarking with CTPs for other nanoparticles and substances present in the USEtox database, while large differences were observed with CTP values for TiO₂ nanoparticles published in earlier studies. Assumptions, which were performed in those previous studies because of lack of data and knowledge at the time they were made, primarily explain such discrepancies. For future assessment of potential toxic impacts of TiO₂ nanoparticles in LCA studies, we therefore recommend the use of our calculated CTP.

TOC



1. Introduction

Owing to their physicochemical properties, such as high surface areas and small sizes, nanomaterials have been increasingly applied in various commodities over the past decade, bringing optimized strengths and efficiencies compared to conventional products. When embedding nanomaterials in product matrices, their emissions might occur through the life cycle of the resulting nano-products.^{1–4} Direct releases during the manufacturing of the nanomaterials may thus take place.⁵ Likewise, depending on the type of location of the nanomaterial in the product matrices, e.g. suspensions in liquids or surface-bound, and on the type of handling, the use and disposal of the nano-products may also lead to potential releases of nanoparticles.^{1,4,6} Several studies have reported the risks and potential impacts to humans and the environment that such releases may cause.^{7–14} To comprehensively assess the environmental impacts of nano-products, it is therefore necessary to quantify the impacts on ecosystems and human health stemming from these releases over the entire life cycle of the nano-products.^{2,3,15,16}

To address this need, the most prominent tool is life cycle assessment (LCA). LCA is a tool, which aims at quantifying all relevant environmental impacts of a product or system taken in its life cycle perspective, i.e. from extraction of the raw materials through its production and use up to its final disposal.¹⁷ In practice, inventories of pollutant emissions aggregated over the system life cycle are translated into potential impact indicators using characterization factors from life cycle impact assessment (LCIA) methods. These LCIA methods rely on models describing the cause-effect chain from the emissions of a substance to its resulting impacts on ecosystems or human health. To characterize the impacts caused by the toxicity of emitted substances on freshwater ecosystems (termed “freshwater ecotoxicity” in the following) and human health (termed “human toxicity”), the European Commission’s International Reference Life Cycle Data System (ILCD) and the US Environmental Protection Agency recommended the USEtox model as best LCIA practice.^{18–20} The USEtox model is a consensus-based model, which allows calculating globally-applicable

65 characterization factors or comparative toxicity potentials (CTP) for assessing freshwater
66 ecotoxicity and human toxicity differentiated into cancer effects and non-cancer effects.^{21,22}
67 To date, more than fifty studies have applied LCA to nano-products.^{15,23} However, most of them
68 have left out the assessment of potential impacts from released nanoparticles.^{15,24} Until now, only
69 twelve studies have investigated the characterization of toxic impacts caused by released
70 nanoparticles. Among these studies, five addressed nanosilver and only accounted for the dissolved
71 fractions thus neglecting potential impact of pristine particles.^{25–29} Three studies focused on CTP for
72 freshwater ecotoxicity of carbon nanotubes,³⁰ graphene oxide³¹ and copper nanoparticles.³² Four
73 studies developed CTP for TiO₂ nanoparticles for freshwater ecotoxicity^{28,33,34} and for human
74 toxicity³⁵ (only for airborne emissions). Most of these studies focus on a specific toxic impact
75 category and/or emission compartment, and none provides CTP for both ecotoxicity and human
76 toxicity impacts and for all emission compartments (air, water, soil), all being necessary for the
77 conduct of comprehensive LCA studies. Taken altogether, the four publications focusing on TiO₂
78 nanoparticles come close to cover all impacts and emission compartments; however, inconsistencies
79 were identified in the determination of the CTP proposed in them, compromising their usefulness in
80 case studies –see Sections 3.5 and 3.6. Considering the large number of nanoproducts on the
81 market,^{4,36–39} the overall limited number of studies addressing the comprehensive derivation of
82 nano-specific comparative toxicity potentials is therefore alarming. Even though science lags
83 behind to adequately assess the toxicity of nanoparticles, there is a need to build experience in
84 developing LCIA of nanoparticles and in applying the resulting CTPs to case studies.²⁴
85 In this context, we therefore aim to (i) adapt the USEtox modelling framework in its currently
86 available version (v.2.0), including the integration of recent advances in environmental fate
87 modelling of nanoparticles, to allow for impact assessment of nanoparticles; and (ii) apply the
88 adapted USEtox model to TiO₂ nanoparticles to calculate consistent CTPs for freshwater
89 ecotoxicity and human toxicity (both cancer and non-cancer effects) for emissions to air, water and

soil compartments that can replace published values. The selection of TiO₂ nanoparticles was made as it is one of the most used nanomaterials on the market and one of the most studied nanoparticles in toxicology,^{36,39} and it also requires updating of the CTP values proposed in recently-published studies by Salieri et al.³³, Miseljic and Olsen²³, Hischier et al.³⁴ and Pini et al.³⁵ (see Sections 3.3-3.5 and 4).

2. Methods

2.1. USEtox framework

The USEtox model (<http://usetox.org>) is set up as a framework which combines matrices relating to the fate, exposure and effects of a given substance.^{21,40,41} In this study, these matrices were determined by identifying relevant data in relation to the exposure and effects of nanoparticles and by altering the fate modelling to account for specific nanoparticle behavior. The version 2.0 of USEtox was used as basis in that effort, and the CTPs were calculated according to Equation 1.

$$\overline{CTP} = \overline{FF} \times \overline{XF} \times \overline{EF} \quad \text{Equation 1}$$

The fate factors (FF) represent the substance residence time in a given compartment in unit of time (in days). The exposure factors (XF) relate a substance concentration to its actual intake (in day⁻¹ for human intake; dimensionless for ecosystems exposure factor). The effect factor (EF) for freshwater ecotoxicity characterizes the fraction of species potentially affected from exposure to the substance and is expressed as a potentially affected fraction of species (PAF) over a volume per mass of exposed substances (in PAF.m³/kg-exposed or m³/kg-exposed). The EFs for human toxicity relate the amount of substance taken in by the population via inhalation or ingestion to the probability of adverse effects (carcinogenic or non-carcinogenic effects) of the substance in the

human body; they are expressed in the unit of cases/kg-intake. The resulting CTPs are expressed in potentially affected fraction of species (PAF) over time and volume of water per mass of emitted substances for freshwater ecotoxicity (in PAF.m³.d/kg-nanoparticles emitted) or in number of potential cancer or non-cancer cases per mass of emitted substances for human toxicity (cases/kg-nanoparticles emitted).

In the following subsections, each factor is individually and critically evaluated and adapted to account for the complexity of the nano-specific properties. Some of the factors may be size-dependent. Wherever possible, the particle size was differentiated, and a default (arbitrary) primary size of 21 nm (diameter) was considered in the calculation of the comparative toxicity potentials; this size is commonly found in particles tested in toxicological studies (e.g. see Table S4).

2.2. Fate factors

The FF determines the concentration in a given compartment to the quantity released by applying multimedia mass balance modelling.²¹ USEtox fate modelling for conventional substances accounts for removal processes, like degradation, burial into sediment, leaching, and intermediate transports between compartments, which are either diffusive or advective.⁴² However, as discrepancies between the fate of conventional chemicals and nanomaterials have been reported, e.g. in water⁴³, the fate modelling requires adaptation.⁴⁴ Two main approaches for modelling the fate of nanoparticles have been proposed in the literature, with the fate and transport of the nanoparticles being modelled either through models relying on partition coefficients or via the use of kinetic models and attachment efficiency α . On-going discussions remain on which approach is better suited for providing parsimony and accuracy (see for example refs. 45–48). In the present study, we have used the Simplebox4nano (SB4N) model, which relies on the Smoluchowski equation to derive attachment rates between ENPs and the natural particles occurring as colloidal particles in

138 soil and sediment pore waters and for both the colloidal and non-colloidal natural particles that are
139 suspended in surface waters.^{49,50} This choice was motivated by the ability of the model to
140 scientifically capture nanoparticle-specific fate and transport aspects while ensuring compatibility
141 and a relatively easy integration into the USEtox fate modelling framework. The USEtox-defined
142 dimensions of the continental and global boxes were thus adapted to the dimensions of the SB4N
143 model.

144 SB4N is an extension of the chemical multimedia fate model SimpleBox⁵¹ that calculates chemical
145 concentrations by performing mass balance equations for transport and degradation processes
146 across air, rain, surface waters, soil and sediment. The model matrix of SimpleBox has been
147 extended to that of SB4N, in which (i) the environmental fate of pristine nanoparticles is simulated
148 as well as that of nanoparticles hetero-aggregated with natural colloid particles (<450 nm) and
149 nanoparticles attached to larger natural particles; (ii) dissolution is treated as a removal mechanism
150 because once a nanoparticle has been dissolved, it is no longer a nano-scaled solid particle; and (iii)
151 the rates at which the nanoparticles strive at thermodynamic equilibrium are represented by
152 dissolution, aggregation and attachment rates.⁴⁹

153 The most significant transformation process for nano-TiO₂ is the aggregation/agglomeration
154 process.⁵² This process is modeled in SB4N by applying the Derjaguin Landau Verwey Overbeek
155 (DLVO) theory, which calculates the interactions between particle surfaces in dispersions. It should
156 be noted that the experimental ecotoxicological studies have so far mostly been performed on
157 aggregates of suspended nanoparticles, which is often termed homo-aggregation. In the
158 environment, nanoparticles will interact with biota, organic and inorganic entities and form what is
159 known as hetero-aggregates. Until now, a distinction in the ecotoxicity exerted by individual, homo-
160 and hetero-aggregated nanoparticles have not been determined experimentally,^{53,54} and more
161 environmentally-relevant studies are still required to provide insights into that question.⁵⁵
162 Therefore, in the absence of further information, the free and homo- and hetero-aggregated particles

are assumed to be bioavailable in the derivation of the fate factors.⁵⁰ Full documentation of the modelling of the aggregation mechanisms and the associated input parameters is available in Supporting Methods and Table S1.

2.3. Exposure factors

The exposure factor (XF) for freshwater ecotoxicity of conventional substances is calculated as the dissolved fraction of the chemical in freshwater.⁴² For nanoparticles, the consideration of both free and aggregated particles as bioavailable in freshwater environment makes XF for freshwater ecotoxicity set to 1 (see Section 2.2). With regard to human exposure, several intake pathways exist and are subdivided into direct and indirect exposure in the USEtox model –see Supporting Methods. Direct exposure can occur through inhalation of contaminated air or ingestion of contaminated drinking water, and the modelling of these impact pathways rely on USEtox landscape parameters, which were left unchanged in the model. Dermal exposure, which is a relevant route to address for exposure to nanoparticles,⁵⁶ e.g. via the use of sunscreen⁵⁷ or textiles⁵⁸ containing nanoparticles, is not encompassed in the USEtox 2.0 model and hence was disregarded in the current study. Indirect exposure covers the ingestion of agricultural produce (divided into above- and below-ground produce), meat, dairy products and fish⁴⁰, and bioaccumulation factors (BAF) corresponding to these exposure pathways are needed.⁴² To the authors' knowledge, no studies reporting biotransformation factors (BTF) for meat or milk exist. Therefore, these two exposure pathways were neglected, and only bioaccumulation factors for fish (BAF_{fish}), above-ground produce (BAF_{above-ground}) and below-ground produce (BAF_{below-ground}) were addressed here. BAF for fish is determined as the ratio of the concentration in the organism over the concentration in the surrounding water, taking into account all exposure routes.⁵⁹ The more accurate and preferred

approach in USEtox is to use experimentally determined BAF_{fish} values.⁴⁰ A literature review was therefore conducted to identify the most suited BAF_{fish} –see details in Supporting Methods.

BAF_{below-ground} can be determined based on the root concentration factor (RCF) with the formula: $BAF_{below-ground} = (\rho_{soil}/\rho_{plant}) \times (0.8 \text{ RCF})$, where ρ_{soil} and ρ_{plant} are the bulk densities of soil and plant, respectively.⁴⁰ As a standard methodology in USEtox, the RCF is determined based on the substance octanol-water partition coefficient (K_{ow}).⁴⁰ However, as this coefficient is not applicable for nanoparticles⁶⁰, an alternative approach was adopted based on correlation models for the transfer of chemicals from soil solutions to roots developed by Briggs et al.⁶¹ RCF can thus be determined as the ratio of the particle concentration in the root and that in the soil water.

BAF_{above-ground} is difficult to determine solely based on experimental data because of the complexity behind the root uptake, air/plant uptake and translocation mechanisms. To measure the plant uptake of organic chemicals, experiments have been conducted in exposure chambers under steady-state exposure conditions. Unlike for organic chemicals,⁶² for which experiments to measure plant uptake have been conducted, no such study could be retrieved for nanoparticles. To predict the BAF_{above-ground}, mass balance modelling like that adapted in USEtox by Trapp and Matthies⁶³ is required. However the strong dependency on K_{ow} in its current form renders it inapplicable to nanoparticles.⁶⁰ In the present study, the BAF_{above-ground} value was therefore assumed identical to the BAF_{below-ground}. Further research to address this gap should be undertaken.

204

2.4. Effect factors for freshwater ecotoxicity

The EF is defined as: $EF = 0.5/HC50_{EC50}$, with $HC50_{EC50}$ being the hazard concentration, at which 50% of the species are exposed to a concentration above their EC50.⁴¹ In USEtox, the HC50 value is calculated as the geometric mean of all available EC50 values for the different species, the choice

of the geometric over the arithmetic means being justified by the need to find best estimates in LCIA modelling and the stronger robustness in cases of limited data sets.^{64,65}

To derive EFs for nano-sized TiO₂, a critical literature review of studies testing ecotoxicity of TiO₂ nanoparticles was first conducted (see Supporting Methods). To ensure quality of the data, this step was complemented by shortlisting the retrieved studies according to 3 conditions: (1) only studies stating an EC₅₀; (2) only studies using tests following standardized test methods (ISO, OECD, ATSM etc.); and (3) excluding tests with severe alterations. A final classification of the retained studies into five different sets (some of them being subsets of others) depending on a number of criteria was performed to test the nano-specificities of the EF. Supporting Methods provide detailed descriptions of these sets of studies, each of them leading to the determination of a corresponding EF, which was interpreted as part of a sensitivity analysis (see Section 3.3).

2.5. Effect factors for human toxicity

In the USEtox model, the EFs for human toxicity are distinguished between carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic effects, each of them being further differentiated between inhalation and ingestion routes.²¹ The effect factor relies on the assumption of linearity in a concentration-response curve up to the point where the lifetime disease probability is 0.5, and is defined as $EF = 0.5/ED_{50}$, with ED₅₀ (in kg-intake/person over lifetime) being the lifetime intake dose resulting in a 50 % increased probability of effects.

To determine ED₅₀ for non-carcinogenic effects of TiO₂ nanoparticles, the study conducted by Laurent et al.⁶⁶ was used. In this study, a critical review of *in vivo* studies was performed and relationships between non-observed adverse effect levels (NOAEL) and the primary particle sizes of the particles were investigated. Statistically-significant associations were identified, although some uncertainties reside in the numerical estimates due to the inability to capture other possibly

233 influential physicochemical properties, e.g. surface coatings.⁶⁶ Expressions of NOAEL for humans
234 as a function of the particle size were thus derived and recommended for use in LCIA of TiO₂
235 nanoparticles until new knowledge allows further refinement.⁶⁶ Effect factors for both inhalation
236 and ingestion routes, considering a default particle size of 21 nm (see Section 2.1), were derived
237 using Equations S9 and S10. Further details are available in Supporting Methods.

238 To derive the EF for carcinogenic effects of TiO₂ nanoparticles via ingestion route, the critical
239 review by Jovanovic⁶⁷ focusing on public health regulations regarding oral ingestion of TiO₂ was
240 used. With regard to cancer effects via inhalation, the intake dose reported by Heinrich et al.⁶⁸ on
241 rats was used as inputs to derive an EDx.⁶⁹ Assuming linearity in the dose-response curve, as
242 demonstrated between carcinogenic effects and low effect doses by Crettaz et al.⁶⁹, an effect factor
243 defined as $EF = (x/100)/EDx$, was then derived. Detailed calculations are reported in Supporting
244 Methods.

245 In EF for both cancer and non-cancer effects, it is important to note that, in addition to the lack of
246 data (e.g. only one usable study for cancer effects via inhalation), most extrapolations (e.g. from
247 animal to humans) stem from conversion factors derived from chemical toxicological studies, and
248 discrepancies may occur when addressing specific nanoparticle behaviors. Considering the lack of
249 insight into this source of uncertainties, we therefore followed the conventional methodology for
250 deriving EF as performed in the USEtox model. Further research is however needed to test these
251 assumptions for nanoparticles and refine the derived EF.

252

253 **3. Results and discussion**

254 The different factors for the fate, exposure and effects of nano-TiO₂ as well as the resulting
255 comparative toxicity potentials were derived. These factors are presented and discussed individually
256 in the following sections, with provision of recommended values wherever relevant. The calculated

CTPs are based on a modified version of the USEtox model (from v.2.0), which accounts for all developments made in this study and are available to LCA practitioners –see Supporting Information.

3.1. Fate factors

The physiochemical data collected for the fate modelling for nano-TiO₂ are reported in Table S1. These data are based on anatase and rutile crystal forms of TiO₂ nanoparticles with an average size of 21 nm and a considered density of 4.23E+3 kg/m³. In the adapted USEtox model (see Supporting Information), it can be observed that the derived fate factors for the free and aggregated forms in water is found equal to 6.33E-1 day and 4.48E+1 day, respectively. This reflects a strong influence of including the aggregated fraction of nanoparticles on the FF (see also Section 3.5).

With the replacement of the USEtox fate model with the SB4N model, a number of relevant differentiation of emission compartments as embedded in USEtox 2.0 are lost in the USEtox 2.0 adapted to nanoparticles, e.g. the industrial indoor air compartment (highly relevant for assessing human toxicity).^{70,71} Future works should therefore focus on developing a fate model, which accounts for the nanoparticle specificities while embedding sufficiently differentiated emission compartments to capture all emission situations that may occur in the life cycle of nanoproducts.

3.2. Exposure factors

Several studies have demonstrated the uptake of nano-TiO₂ in fish, including the uptake in gills, brain, skin and other organs.^{72–76} However, none of them have derived BAF values based on the measured concentrations because of difficulties to address nanoparticle properties, in particular the incomplete coverage of uptake routes needed to calculate the BAF.⁷⁷ The uptake from dietary

280 exposure in the aquatic environment is thus typically neglected in studies, resulting in the
281 determination of bioconcentration factors (BCF) instead of a BAF.

282 In the current study, two BAF proxies were therefore determined based on BCF values. A first BAF
283 proxy of 21.4 was determined based on the geometric mean of several identified BCF values –see
284 Table S2. A second BCF of 35.3 was derived based on the study by Yeo & Nam⁷⁸, who set up a
285 microcosm including several trophic levels. Although the use of BCF values as BAF proxies can be
286 acceptable in the absence of better data, Zhu et al. showed that the body burden for *D. rerio* was
287 higher when exposed to nano-TiO₂ contaminated *D. magna* compared to aqueous exposure
288 indicating that the dietary exposure could play a significant role in the uptake of nanoparticles.⁷⁹
289 Therefore, the BCF value of 35.3 derived from the study by Yeo & Nam,⁷⁸ who included exposure
290 through both water and diet, was selected as expected to be a closer proxy to an actual BAF.

291 For below-ground produce, the BAF_{below-ground} was calculated as the geometric mean of several BAF
292 values obtained for different plants, for which accumulation and uptake of nano-TiO₂ were
293 investigated^{80,81} –see Table S3. A BAF_{below-ground} of 2.9 was thus determined. This value appears
294 very low in regards to typical ranges of bioaccumulation factors, thus suggesting that the
295 bioaccumulation of nano-TiO₂ in roots, and hence in the below-ground produce, may be very
296 limited.

297 As indicated in Section 2.4, due to lack of data, the BAF_{above-ground} was estimated from the BAF for
298 below-ground produce. They were assumed equal, resulting in a BAF_{above-ground} value of 2.9. This
299 assumption seems acceptable as little or no translocation between roots, leaves and fruits have been
300 reported in the majority of studies identified.^{82–85} If no translocation of particles takes place, the
301 BAF_{above-ground} in relation to the soil compartment can be argued to be equal to the concentration in
302 the roots of the plants and thus be equal to the BAF_{below-ground}. It should however be noted that
303 translocation were evidenced for other nanoparticles (e.g. Ag, Zn, Cu, Co, etc.) indicating that the

304 behavior of nanoparticles in both soil and plant medias is particle-specific and likely depends on
305 their physicochemical properties (e.g. solubility).^{82,86–88}

306

307 **3.3. Effect factor freshwater ecotoxicity**

308 From the literature review, a total of 65 relevant publications was identified covering 22 different
309 species –see Table S4. Results for the five sets of EFs are provided in Table S5 and range between
310 9.4 and 26.9 PAF.m³/kg-exposed (trophic level). The EF value of 26.9 PAF m³/kg is recommended
311 for use as it relies on studies, which were identified as adequately testing ecotoxicity of
312 nanoparticles, i.e. specific requirements were fulfilled in relation to the distinctive behavior of
313 nanoparticles (based on Lützhøft et al.⁸⁹ –see Supporting Methods).

314 Two studies can be used for comparison with this finding. Miseljic and Olsen²³ identified 12
315 studies, which cover data published up to 2011 and resulting in 27 possible endpoints, and reported
316 an EF of 26.1 PAF m³/kg for freshwater ecotoxicity of TiO₂, while Salieri et al.³³, who identified 32
317 studies covering data published up to 2013 and resulting in 30 possible endpoints, reported an EF
318 value of 28.1 PAF.m³/kg. The value recommended in our study is nearly identical to the values
319 reported in those two sources, which may thus indicate a high consistency.

320 To put the results in perspective, the recommended EF value was compared to the existing EFs in
321 USEtox for both organic and inorganic chemicals (amounting to ca. 2500 chemicals) along with the
322 values reported by Salieri et al.³³ and Miseljic and Olsen²³ –see Figure S1. The recommended EF
323 for TiO₂ is observed to be in the lower range of EF values for both organic and inorganic chemicals.
324 TiO₂ has been showed to exert low toxicity compared to other metal oxides, like ZnO or CuO.^{90,91} It
325 therefore makes plausible the relative positioning of nano-TiO₂ among other chemicals reported in
326 USEtox, and thus our recommended EF value.

The relative variability in the EF value, ranging 9.4-26.9 PAF m³/kg across the 5 sets at the trophic level (see Table S5) can primarily be explained by the influence that highly sensitive species may have on the results (e.g. protozoa). These observations therefore call for developing specific data selection guidelines to derive consistent EFs for nanoparticles in future studies. Until such guidelines emerge, a 2-step procedure should be followed, using the nano-specific criteria set by Lützhøft, et al.⁸⁹ to shortlist the studies before applying the methodology described in Larsen and Hauschild.^{64,65}

3.4. Effect factors for human toxicity

The recommended effect factors for human toxicity, cancer and non-cancer effects, are reported in Table 1. Background documentation pertaining to their determination is available in Supporting Methods.

Table 1. Recommended EF for nano-TiO₂ for human toxicity, cancer and non-cancer effects.

Impact/impact pathway		Value ^a	Unit	Applicability
Human toxicity - cancer effects	Inhalation (nanosized)	1.54E-1 [-]	cases/kg-inhaled	Applicable for particle sizes between 15-40 nm
	Inhalation (microsized)	1.10E-2 [-]	cases/kg-inhaled	Applicable for particle sizes between 1.5-1.7 µm
	Ingestion	0 [-]	cases/kg-ingested	No cancer effects assumed
Human toxicity - non-cancer effects	Inhalation	1.15 [0.38; 3.48]	cases/kg-inhaled	Values set for 21 nm primary particle size (size dependency available in Equations S9 and S10)
	Ingestion	2.94E-2 [9.72E-3; 8.89E-2]	cases/kg-ingested	

^a Confidence intervals were derived whenever possible and are provided in brackets

345 The obtained EF values from Table 1 were compared to Pini et al.³⁵, who published EF values for
346 indoor and outdoor inhalation exposure to TiO₂ nanoparticles for both non-cancer and cancer
347 effects. In addition, they were put in perspective with the USEtox 2.0 database of effect factors for
348 organics and inorganics (total of ca. 1000 EF values). Figures S2 and S3 illustrate those
349 comparisons for non-cancer effects and cancer effects, respectively.

350 For non-cancer effects, Pini et al.³⁵ report an EF value of 7.26E-3 cases/kg-intake, which is ca. 160
351 times lower than our EF value of 1.15 cases/kg-intake (see Table 1). This discrepancy can mainly
352 be explained by the assumption made by Pini et al.³⁵ to use a no-observed adverse effect level
353 (NOAEL) value for ingestion exposure when determining an EF for inhalation. As reported in
354 Laurent et al.⁶⁶, NOAELs differ by several orders of magnitude between the two exposure routes,
355 with regression analyses on available toxicological data for TiO₂ showing a factor of ca. 40 between
356 the two.⁶⁶ Provided that the extrapolations from NOAELs (expressed as daily chronic intake dose)
357 to ED50 and the subsequent calculations of the EF are the same between ingestion and inhalation
358 routes,^{21,40} a difference observed in the NOAELs between the two routes is thus propagated to the
359 corresponding EF values (see for example the differences of factor ca. 40 between EFs for non-
360 cancer effects reported in Table 1). The observed underestimation is also suggested when
361 comparing with the EF for inhalation for organics and inorganics reported in USEtox 2.0, where
362 Pini et al.'s EF value falls in the lower 25 percentile of both organics and inorganics –see Figure
363 S2A. In contrast, our recommended EF values for inhalation of nano-TiO₂ fall close to the mean of
364 EFs for inorganic chemicals and just above the range of EFs for organic chemicals (Figure S2A).
365 For the ingestion pathway, the EF value provided in the present study falls close to the mean of the
366 organics and just below the inorganics (see Figure S2B). Such comparisons seem reasonable
367 considering the large number of organic and inorganic substances in the USEtox database.

368 With respect to cancer effects via inhalation, Pini et al.³⁵ reported an EF value of 1.77E+2 cases/kg-
369 inhaled (outdoor emission), which is more than 3 orders of magnitude higher than our reported EF

370 value of 0.15 case/kg-inhaled (Table 1). This estimate by Pini et al.³⁵ is also observed to range
371 among the top carcinogenic substances in the EF for organics and to be well above any EF of metals
372 reported in USEtox 2.0 for cancer effects (see Figure S3). This is regarded as unrealistic
373 considering the IARC classification of TiO₂ as possibly carcinogenic to humans⁹², in contrast to
374 substances like arsenic, nickel or beryllium, all of them being classified as carcinogenic to humans
375 and reported in USEtox 2.0. Based on the study by Laurent et al.⁶⁶, who used the National Institute
376 of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) exposure thresholds⁹³, as did Pini et al.³⁵, an EF value
377 of 7.4E-2 cases/kg-inhaled should be found when applying the methodology reported by Pini et al.³⁵

378 With respect to the ingestion pathway, Jovanović⁶⁷ showed that although nano-TiO₂ has the
379 potential for absorption and storage in various organs by mammals, no study has demonstrated that
380 ingestion of TiO₂ could induce carcinogenic effects.^{67,92} Therefore, the EF value for carcinogenic
381 effects through ingestion was set to 0 cases / kg-ingested (see Table 1). For non-cancer effects, no
382 comparative study could be done as, to the authors' knowledge, no studies have investigated this
383 exposure route yet.

384 As indicated in Table 1, a particle size differentiation could only be considered for the EF values for
385 non-cancer effects, following the work by Laurent et al.⁶⁶ When applying Equations S9 and S10,
386 which can be used to determine EF as a function of the size, a decrease of the EFs for non-cancer
387 effects by a factor of ca. 6 was observed between TiO₂ nanoparticles with primary size of 10nm and
388 100-nm TiO₂ particles. Although not investigated further in this study, such results suggest the
389 relevance to consistently include size differentiation when determining CTP values for
390 nanoparticles. To a larger extent, a differentiation accounting for relevant physicochemical
391 properties of the nanoparticles, e.g. surface treatment or coatings, which may influence the fate,
392 exposure and effects of the nanoparticles, and thus the resulting CTP values, need to be further
393 explored. Such explorative studies, which should additionally match the actual properties of the

nanoparticles released to the environment, however remain currently hampered by the lack of comprehensive and transparent reporting of the tested nanoparticles in toxicological studies.^{39,55,66,94}

3.5. Comparative toxic potentials for freshwater ecotoxicity

Table 2 shows the comparative toxicity potentials for freshwater ecotoxicity resulting from the combination of the recommended fate, exposure and effect factors described in Sections 3.1-3.3.

Table 2. Comparative toxic potentials (CTPs) for freshwater ecotoxicity of TiO₂ nanoparticles

Emission compartments	Comparative Toxic Potentials (CTUe or PAF.m ³ .d/kg _{emitted})
Emission to air	6.05E+02
Emission to freshwater	1.55E+03
Emissions to soil	1.19E+00

The recommended CTP of 1.55E+03 PAF.m³.d/ kg-emitted for emissions to freshwater (see Table 2) can be compared to the values derived by Salieri et al.³³ and Miseljcic²⁸, who reported CTP values of 2.8E-01 and 1.48E-01 PAF.m³.d/ kg-emitted, respectively. These published factors are 3-4 orders of magnitude smaller than the CTP developed in the current study –see Figure 1A. This large difference is caused by the inclusion of the toxic impacts of aggregated particles in our model, unlike those of Salieri et al.³³ and Miseljcic²⁸. By simulating the disregard of aggregates, the recommended CTP value virtually drops by 3 orders of magnitude to 1.82 PAF.m³.d/ kg-emitted (see Figure 1A). Both studies by Salieri et al.³³ and Miseljcic²⁸ modelled aggregation as a removal process in the fate of the nanoparticles, which result in largely underestimated fate factors (and hence CTP values) since a large fraction of the emitted nanoparticles, i.e. all aggregated nanoparticles, end up being removed and are thus not bioavailable to cause effects in the exposed organisms. When conducting ecotoxicity testing on nanoparticles, several studies have reported that the species take up both the pristine and the aggregates,^{95,96} and most of the current toxicological

416 studies, which are used in the determination of EF, are based on suspensions covering both pristine
417 particles and aggregates.^{97,98} Therefore, the inclusion of both states of the particles when deriving the
418 CTPs for nanoparticles, as done in the current study, is strongly recommended.

419 This is also in line with the study by Eckelman et al.³⁰ who derived CTP for freshwater ecotoxicity
420 for CNT. The only removal process considered in the latter study was the advection in the ocean,
421 which resulted in a conservative CTP of 2.9E+04 PAF.m³.d/ kg-emitted to freshwater, thus in a
422 similar range to the CTP derived in our work (ca. 20 times higher than that of TiO₂; see Table 2). In
423 two additional studies, Deng et al.³¹ determined a CTP of 7.89E+02 PAF.m³.d/ kg-emitted to
424 freshwater for graphene oxide, thus approximately twice lower than our CTP for TiO₂
425 nanoparticles, while Pu et al.³² determined a CTP of 5.96E+03 PAF.m³.d/ kg-emitted to freshwater
426 for CuO nanoparticles (with regional variation ranges of 3.87-11.1E+03 PAF.m³.d/ kg), hence four
427 times higher than our estimate for TiO₂. Although the modelling in these studies vary (e.g. fate), the
428 CTP values are within same orders of magnitude and consistent with reported toxicity rankings (e.g.
429 CuO nanoparticles being more toxic than TiO₂ nanoparticles⁹⁹), suggesting a relatively good
430 precision of these studies.

431 In the same manner as the effect factors (see Sections 3.3 and 3.4), the obtained comparative
432 toxicity potentials for nano-TiO₂ were benchmarked against existing CTP present in the USEtox
433 database for organic and inorganic chemicals –see Figures 1A, 1B and 1C for air, freshwater and
434 soil emission compartments, respectively. The drop of the CTP derived by Salieri et al.³³ and
435 Miselic²⁸ for freshwater emissions at the bottom of the entire USEtox CTP database, which amounts
436 to ca. 2500 organic and 27 inorganic substances, confirms the likelihood that these CTP are largely
437 underestimated (see Figures 1A). In contrast, the CTP values obtained in our study fall within the
438 lower range of CTPs for inorganics and the median or higher range of CTPs for organics, which is
439 considered plausible (see Figures 1A-1C).




Figure 1. Comparative Toxic Potentials (CTP) for freshwater ecotoxicity of TiO₂ nanoparticles plotted against existing USEtox CTP database for emissions to (A) freshwater, (B) air (differentiated between urban air and rural air), and (C) soil compartments. The box plots represent the 25th to the 75th percentile of the CTPs and the upper and lower whiskers represent the maximum and minimum CTPs reported in USEtox (total of 2499 organics and 27 inorganics). Comparisons with Salieri et al.³³ and Miseljc²⁸ can only be made for the freshwater emission compartment. Note that the CTPs are plotted on a logarithmic scale.

3.6. Comparative toxic potentials for human toxicity

The recommended CTPs for human toxicity for non-carcinogenic and carcinogenic effects are reported in Table 3 for air, freshwater and soil emission compartments. Additional sets of CTPs were also calculated for different scenarios to test the influence of variations in the BAF_{fish} derivations and the confidence intervals associated with the EF for human toxicity, non-cancer effects although relatively minor influences were observed (see Table S6).

Table 3. Comparative toxic potentials (CTPs) for human toxicity of TiO₂ nanoparticles

Emission compartments	Comparative Toxic Potentials (CTUh or cases/kg _{emitted})	
	Cancer effects	Non-cancer effects
Emission to air	1.90E-06	1.70E-05 ^a
Emission to freshwater	0.00E+00	1.25E-06 ^a
Emissions to soil	0.00E+00	1.42E-08 ^a

^a CTPs are given for a primary size of 21 nm (see Sections 2.1 and 3.4).

459 As observed in Table 3, because the EF via ingestion for carcinogenic effects was estimated to be
460 null (see Section 3.4) and because nanoparticles do not volatilize, the CTPs for carcinogenic effects
461 for freshwater and soil emissions are equal to zero. For the remaining CTP values of Table 3,
462 comparisons with the CTP values reported in Pini et al.³⁵ for inhalation exposure (outdoor) and with
463 the CTP database in USEtox v.2.0 can be made –see Figure 2.

464 For non-cancer effects, the CTP values from Pini et al.³⁵ plotted in Figure 2B reveal the strong
465 influence of the underestimated EF value, in which ingestion data were used for estimating the
466 inhalation effect factor (see Section 3.4). With regard to cancer effects, abnormally high EF values
467 (see Section 3.4) suggest largely overestimated CTP values in Pini et al.³⁵, although some of these
468 overestimations are compensated by lower intake fractions due to different geographical settings
469 (Pini et al.³⁵ adapted the USEtox model landscape and population parameters to Swiss conditions)
470 and a different particle size (Pini et al.³⁵ considered a particle size of 10 nm). In contrast, the CTP
471 values estimated in our study fall in the range of CTPs for organics and below the range for
472 inorganics. Such results seem consistent as TiO₂ and titanium in general are not reported to be
473 strongly bioaccumulative nor strongly toxic substances compared to other metals and metalloids
474 (e.g. Ag).^{100–102}
475




Figure 2. Comparative Toxic Potentials (CTP) for human toxicity of TiO₂ nanoparticles plotted against existing USEtox CTP database for (A) non-cancer effects – emissions to air (differentiated between urban and rural air compartments), (B) non-cancer effects – emissions to freshwater, and (C) cancer effects – emissions to air (differentiated between urban and rural air compartments). The box plots represent the 25th to the 75th percentile of the CTPs and the upper and lower whiskers represent the maximum and minimum CTPs reported in USEtox (total of 1024 organics and 15 inorganics for human toxicity, non-cancer effect, and 427 organics and 18 inorganics for cancer effects). No lower whiskers are plotted for cancer effects as some compounds are reported with CTP of 0 CTUh (non-carcinogenic substances). Note that the CTPs are plotted on a logarithmic scale.

3.7. Applications of CTP and recommendations

Using the adapted USEtox model, comparative toxicity potentials were developed for TiO₂ nanoparticles for characterizing freshwater ecotoxicity and human toxicity, both cancer and non-

491 cancer effects, resulting from emissions to air, water and soil compartments. These CTP values are
 492 recommended for application in LCA studies in lieu of values published in earlier studies.^{23,33–35}
 493 Following the works by Eckelman et al.³⁰ and Deng et al.³¹, the present study, and in particular its
 494 methodological approach, can be considered as a first step towards more systematic and consistent
 495 determinations of CTP for all emission compartments for nanoparticles using the USEtox model as
 496 starting point and adjusting it (e.g. fate modelling, effect data, etc.) to integrate the specificities of
 497 each nanoparticles. This will enable comparability with chemicals already characterized with the
 498 model and thus allow performing life cycle assessment to gauge the potential impacts and relevance
 499 of released nanoparticles compared to that of other contributing substances in the life cycle of
 500 nanoproducts. To pursue efforts in this direction and enable LCA studies to include impacts of
 501 nanoparticles, a number of recommendations for the LCIA modelling of nanoparticles and the
 502 applications of derived CTPs are provided in Table 4.

503

504 **Table 4.** Recommendations to LCA practitioners and method developers for life cycle impact
 505 assessment of nanoparticles.

Fate modelling
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fate modelling should consider nano-specific transformations processes such as attachment efficiencies and dissolution and not be dependent on parameters driving the fate of conventional substances such as partitioning coefficients between dissolved organic carbon, suspended solids, sediment particles or soil particles and water used for the fate of conventional inorganics (see Section 2.2). • When deriving the final CTPs both the aggregated and the free/pristine particles should be considered bioavailable and thus included in the CTP calculation (see Section 2.2. and 3.5).
Exposure modelling
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other exposure routes that are not included in the present USEtox model should be investigated. These include the dermal exposure to engineered nanoparticles present in cosmetics or health care products.
Effect modelling
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data applied for deriving effect factors should be evaluated according to documentation of experimental conditions and nanomaterial properties such as aggregation, surface area, etc. (see Section 2.4 and 2.5); alternatively, they should follow the nano-specific guidelines published by OECD.¹⁰³

- The possible influence of size on the human toxicity EF should be investigated in further details, particularly for the carcinogenic effects. The influence of other physicochemical properties on the CTP values should also be explored.

Overall CTP development and application in practice

- There is a need to develop CTPs for nanoparticles matching the actual properties of the released nanoparticles from nano-products. Several studies have evidenced a mismatch between the released nanoparticles and the pristine forms that are used in fate, exposure and effect modelling. The use of CTPs based on pristine nanoparticle data (as done in all existing studies) likely leads to overestimated impact results attributable to engineered nanoparticles, and should be considered with care by LCA practitioners when interpreting their results.
- Owing to the different properties and behavior of each nanoparticle (e.g. carbon nanotubes vs. TiO₂ nanoparticles), further research is needed to consistently address the most important transformation processes in the fate modelling and the effects on ecosystems and human health.

506

507 **4. Associated content**

508 Supporting Information Available: Contains (1) the adapted USEtox model to derive CTP for
509 nanoparticles, (2) a PDF of Supporting Information containing Supporting Methods documenting
510 the detailed methodology and background data for the determination of the fate, exposure and effect
511 factors for freshwater ecotoxicity and human toxicity as well as Supporting Figures and Tables to
512 complement the section Results and Discussion of the manuscript.

513

514 **5. Acknowledgements**

515 The authors wish to thank Olivier Jolliet, Henrik F. Larsen, Stig I. Olsen and Lars Sjolding for their
516 commenting and advices in the conduct of this work. AK acknowledges the received funding from
517 the European Union (EU) Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under Grant
518 Agreement no 263147 (NanoValid—Development of reference methods for hazard identification,
519 risk assessment and LCA of engineered nanomaterials).

520

521 **6. References**

- 522 (1) Hansen, S. F.; Michelson, E. S.; Kamper, A.; Borling, P.; Stuer-Lauridsen, F.; Baun, A.
523 Categorization framework to aid exposure assessment of nanomaterials in consumer products.
524 *Ecotoxicology* **2008**, 17 (5), 438–447.
- 525 (2) Grieger, K. D.; Laurent, A.; Miseljic, M.; Christensen, F.; Baun, A.; Olsen, S. I. Analysis of
526 current research addressing complementary use of life-cycle assessment and risk assessment
527 for engineered nanomaterials: have lessons been learned from previous experience with
528 chemicals? *J. Nanopart. Res.* **2012**, 14 (7), 1–23.
- 529 (3) Som, C.; Berges, M.; Chaudhry, Q.; Dusinska, M.; Fernandes, T. F.; Olsen, S. I.; Nowack, B.
530 The importance of life cycle concepts for the development of safe nanoproducts. *Toxicology*
531 **2010**, 269 (2–3), 160–169.
- 532 (4) Hansen, S. F.; Heggelund, L. R.; Revilla Besora, P.; Mackevica, A.; Boldrin, A.; Baun, A.
533 Nanoproducts – what is actually available to European consumers? *Environ. Sci. Nano* **2016**,
534 3 (1), 169–180.
- 535 (5) Demou, E.; Stark, W. J.; Hellweg, S. Particle emission and exposure during nanoparticle
536 synthesis in research laboratories. *Ann. Occup. Hyg.* **2009**, 53 (8), 829–838.
- 537 (6) Gottschalk, F.; Nowack, B. The release of engineered nanomaterials to the environment. *J.*
538 *Environ. Monit.* **2011**, 13 (5), 1145–1155.
- 539 (7) Maynard, A. D.; Aitken, R. J.; Butz, T.; Colvin, V.; Donaldson, K.; Oberdörster, G.; Philbert,
540 M. A.; Ryan, J.; Seaton, A.; Stone, V.; et al. Safe handling of nanotechnology. *Nature* **2006**,
541 444 (7117), 267–269.
- 542 (8) Nel, A.; Xia, T.; Mädler, L.; Li, N. Toxic potential of materials at the nanolevel. *Science*
543 **2006**, 311, 622–627.
- 544 (9) Oberdörster, G.; Oberdörster, E.; Oberdörster, J. Nanotoxicology: An emerging discipline
545 evolving from studies of ultrafine particles. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2005**, 113 (7), 823–
546 839.
- 547 (10) Oberdörster, G. Safety assessment for nanotechnology and nanomedicine: concepts of
548 nanotoxicology. *J. Intern. Med.* **2010**, 267 (1), 89–105.
- 549 (11) SCENIHR (Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks). *Risk*
550 *Assessment of Products of Nanotechnologies*. European Commission Health and Consumer
551 Protection Directorate – General, Directorate C – Public Health and Risk Assessment,
552 Brussels, BE, 2009. Available at:
553 http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_risk/committees/04_scenihr/docs/scenihr_o_023.pdf (Accessed
554 January 2017).
- 555 (12) Stone, V.; Hankin, S.; Aitken, R.; Aschberger, K.; Baun, A.; Christensen, F.; Fernandes, T.;

- 556 Hansen, S. F.; Hartmann, N. B.; Hutchinson, G.; et al. *Engineered Nanoparticles: Review of*
557 *Health and Environmental Safety (ENRHES)*; ENRHES EU FP 7 project, final report, 2010.
558 Available at: <http://www.nanowerk.com/nanotechnology/reports/reportpdf/report133.pdf>
559 (Accessed January 2017).
- 560 (13) Wiesner, M. R.; Lowry, G. V.; Alvarez, P.; Dionysiou, D.; Biswas, P. Assessing the risks of
561 manufactured nanomaterials. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2006**, 40 (14), 4336–4345
- 562 (14) Bettini, S.; Boutet-robinet, E.; Cartier, C.; Coméra, C.; Gaultier, E.; Dupuy, J.; Naud, N.;
563 Taché, S.; Grysan, P.; Reguer, S.; et al. Food-grade TiO₂ impairs intestinal and systemic
564 immune homeostasis, initiates preneoplastic lesions and promotes aberrant crypt
565 development in the rat colon. *Scientific Reports* **2017**, 7, 40373. doi:10.1038/srep40373.
- 566 (15) Jolliet, O.; Laurent, A.; Rosenbaum, R. K. Life Cycle Risks and Impacts of
567 Nanotechnologies. In: *Nanotechnology and Human Health*; Malsch I. and Emond C., Eds.;
568 ISBN 9780849381447. Taylor & Francis, Boca Raton, FL, USA, **2014**, 213–278.
- 569 (16) Walker, W. C.; Bosso, C. J.; Eckelman, M.; Isaacs, J. A.; Pourzahedi, L. Integrating life cycle
570 assessment into managing potential EHS risks of engineered nanomaterials: reviewing
571 progress to date. *J. Nanoparticle Res.* **2015**, 46 (3), 344.
- 572 (17) Hauschild, M. Z. Assessing environmental impacts in a life-cycle perspective. *Environ. Sci.*
573 *Technol.* **2005**, 39 (4), 81A–88A.
- 574 (18) Hauschild, M. Z.; Goedkoop, M.; Guinée, J.; Heijungs, R.; Huijbregts, M.; Jolliet, O.;
575 Margni, M.; De Schryver, A.; Humbert, S.; Laurent, A.; Sala, S.; Pant, R. Identifying best
576 existing practice for characterization modeling in life cycle impact assessment. *Int. J. Life*
577 *Cycle Assess.* **2013**, 18 (3), 683–697.
- 578 (19) European Commission – Joint Research Centre – Institute for Environment and Sustainability.
579 *International Reference Life Cycle Data System (ILCD) Handbook – Recommendations for*
580 *Life Cycle Impact Assessment in the European context*. First edition. EUR24571EN. ISBN
581 978-92-79-17451-3. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, LU, 2011.
- 582 (20) US-EPA. *Tool for the Reduction and Assessment of Chemical and Other Environmental*
583 *Impacts (TRACI) – TRACI version 2.1 User's Guide*. US Environmental Protection
584 Agency, Cincinnati, OH, US, 2012.
- 585 (21) Rosenbaum, R. K.; Bachmann, T. M.; Gold, L. S.; Huijbregts, M. A. J.; Jolliet, O.; Juraske,
586 R.; Koehler, A.; Larsen, H. F.; MacLeod, M.; Margni, M.; et al. USEtox-the UNEP-SETAC
587 toxicity model: recommended characterisation factors for human toxicity and freshwater
588 ecotoxicity in life cycle impact assessment. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **2008**, 13, 532–546.
- 589 (22) Hauschild, M. Z.; Huijbregts, M.; Jolliet, O.; Macleod, M.; Margni, M.; Rosenbaum, R. K.;

- van de Meent, D.; McKone, T. E. Building a model based on scientific consensus for life cycle impact assessment of chemicals: The search for harmony and parsimony. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2008**, 42 (19), 7032–7037.
- (23) Miseljic, M.; Olsen, S. I. Life-cycle assessment of engineered nanomaterials: A literature review of assessment status. *J. Nanopart. Res.* **2014**, 16 (6), 2427.
- (24) Gilbertson, L. M.; Wender, B. A.; Zimmerman, J. B.; Eckelman, M. J. Coordinating modeling and experimental research of engineered nanomaterials to improve life cycle assessment studies. *Environ. Sci. Nano* **2015**, 2 (6), 669–682.
- (25) Walser, T.; Demou, E.; Lang, D. J.; Hellweg, S. Prospective environmental life cycle assessment of nanosilver T-Shirts. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2011**, 45 (10), 4570–4578.
- (26) Meyer, D. E.; Curran, M. A.; Gonzalez, M. A. An examination of silver nanoparticles in socks using screening-level life cycle assessment. *J. Nanopart. Res.* **2011**, 13 (1), 147–156.
- (27) Pourzahedi, L.; Eckelman, M. J. Environmental life cycle assessment of nanosilver-enabled bandages. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2015**, 49 (1), 361–368.
- (28) Miseljic, M. *Improvement of methodological and data background for life cycle assessment of nano-metaloxides*. PhD Thesis, Technical University of Denmark, Kgs. Lyngby, DK, 2015.
- (29) Hicks, A. L.; Gilbertson, L. M.; Yamani, J. S.; Theis, T. L.; Zimmerman, J. B. Life cycle payback estimates of nanosilver enabled textiles under different silver loading, release, and laundering scenarios informed by literature review. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2015**, 49 (13), 7529–7542.
- (30) Eckelman, M. J.; Mauter, M. S.; Isaacs, J. A.; Elimelech, M. New perspectives on nanomaterial aquatic ecotoxicity: Production impacts exceed direct exposure impacts for carbon nanotubes. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2012**, 46 (5), 2902–2910.
- (31) Deng, Y.; Li, J.; Qiu, M.; Yang, F.; Zhang, J.; Yuan, C. Deriving characterization factors on freshwater ecotoxicity of graphene oxide nanomaterial for life cycle impact assessment. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **2017**, 22 (2), 222–236.
- (32) Pu, Y.; Tang, F.; Adam, P.-M.; Laratte, B.; Ionescu, R. E. Fate and characterization factors of nanoparticles in seventeen subcontinental freshwaters: A case study on copper nanoparticles. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2016**, 50 (17), 9370–9379.
- (33) Salieri, B.; Righi, S.; Pasteris, A.; Olsen, S. I. Freshwater ecotoxicity characterisation factor for metal oxide nanoparticles: A case study on titanium dioxide nanoparticle. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2015**, 505, 494–502.
- (34) Hischier, R.; Nowack, B.; Gottschalk, F.; Hincapie, I.; Steinfeldt, M.; Som, C. Life cycle assessment of facade coating systems containing manufactured nanomaterials. *J. Nanopart.*

- 624 *Res.* **2015**, 17 (2), 68.
- 625 (35) Pini, M.; Salieri, B.; Ferrari, A. M.; Nowack, B.; Hirschier, R. Human health characterization
626 factors of nano-TiO₂ for indoor and outdoor environments. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **2016**, 21
627 (10), 1452-1462.
- 628 (36) Mitrano, D. M.; Motellier, S.; Clavaguera, S.; Nowack, B. Review of nanomaterial aging and
629 transformations through the life cycle of nano-enhanced products. *Environ. Int.* **2015**, 77,
630 132–147.
- 631 (37) Hendren, C. O.; Mesnard, X.; Dröge, J.; Wiesner, M. R. Estimating Production Data for Five
632 Engineered Nanomaterials As a Basis for Exposure Assessment. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2011**,
633 45, 2562–2569.
- 634 (38) Keller, A. A.; McFerran, S.; Lazareva, A.; Suh, S. Global life cycle releases of engineered
635 nanomaterials. *J. Nanopart. Res.* **2013**, 15, 1692.
- 636 (39) Krug, H. F. Nanosafety Research — Are We on the Right Track ? *Angewandte.* **2014**, 12304–
637 12319
- 638 (40) Rosenbaum, R. K.; Huijbregts, M. A. J.; Henderson, A. D.; Margni, M.; McKone, T. E.;
639 Meent, D. van de; Hauschild, M. Z.; Shaked, S.; Li, D. S.; Gold, L. S.; et al. USEtox human
640 exposure and toxicity factors for comparative assessment of toxic emissions in life cycle
641 analysis: Sensitivity to key chemical properties. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **2011**, 16 (8), 710–
642 727.
- 643 (41) Henderson, A. D.; Hauschild, M. Z.; Meent, D. van de; Huijbregts, M. A. J.; Larsen, H. F.;
644 Margni, M.; McKone, T. E.; Payet, J.; Rosenbaum, R. K.; Jolliet, O. USEtox fate and
645 ecotoxicity factors for comparative assessment of toxic emissions in life cycle analysis:
646 sensitivity to key chemical properties. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **2011**, 16 (8), 701–709.
- 647 (42) Huijbregts, M.; Hauschild, M.; Jolliet, O.; Margni, M.; McKone, T.; Rosenbaum, R. K.; van
648 de Meent, D. *USEtox User Manual. v1.01*. USEtox Team, 2010.
- 649 (43) Quik, J. T. K.; Vonk, J. A.; Hansen, S. F.; Baun, A.; van de Meent, D. How to assess
650 exposure of aquatic organisms to manufactured nanoparticles? *Environ. Int.* **2011**, 37 (6),
651 1068–1077.
- 652 (44) Meesters, J. A.; Veltman, K.; Hendriks, A. J.; van de Meent, D. Environmental exposure
653 assessment of engineered nanoparticles: why REACH needs adjustment. *Integr. Environ.*
654 *Assess. Manag.* **2013**, 9 (3), 15-26.
- 655 (45) Praetorius, A.; Tufenkji, N.; Goss, K.; Scheringer, M. The road to nowhere : equilibrium
656 partition coefficients for nanoparticles. *Environ. Sci. Nano* **2014**, 1, 317–323.
- 657 (46) Cornelis, G. Fate descriptors for engineered nanoparticles: the good, the bad, and the ugly.

- 658 *Environ. Sci. Nano* **2015**, 2, 19–26.
- 659 (47) Dale, A. L.; Casman, E. A.; Lowry, G. V.; Lead, J. R.; Viparelli, E.; Baalousha, M. Modeling
660 nanomaterial environmental fate in aquatic systems. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2015**, 49 (5),
661 2587–2593.
- 662 (48) Dale, A. L.; Lowry, V.; Casman, E. A. Much ado about alpha: Reframing the debate over
663 appropriate fate descriptors in nanoparticle environmental risk modeling. *Environ. Sci. Nano*
664 **2015**, 2, 27–32.
- 665 (49) Meesters, J. A.; Koelmans, A. A.; Quik, J. T. K.; Hendriks, A. J.; van de Meent, D.
666 Multimedia modeling of engineered nanoparticles with simpleBox4nano: Model definition
667 and evaluation. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2014**, 48 (10), 5726–5736.
- 668 (50) Meesters, J. A.; Quik, J. T. K.; Koelmans, A. A.; Hendriks, A. J.; van de Meent, D.
669 Multimedia environmental fate and speciation of engineered nanoparticles: A probabilistic
670 modeling approach. *Environ. Sci. Nano* **2016**, 3 (4), 715–727.
- 671 (51) Brandes, L.J.; den Hollander, H.; van de Meent, D. *SimpleBox 2.0: A nested multimedia fate*
672 *model for evaluating the environmental fate of chemicals*. RIVM Report no. 719101029.
673 National Institute of Public Health and the Environment, Bilthoven, NL, 1996.
- 674 (52) Hartmann, N. B.; Skjolding, L. M.; Hansen, S. F.; Kjølholt, J.; Gottschalck, F.; Baun, A.
675 *Environmental fate and behaviour of nanomaterials: New knowledge on important*
676 *transformation processes*. Environmental project No. 1594. The Danish Environmental
677 Protection Agency, Copenhagen, DK, 2014.
- 678 (53) Hund-Rinke, K.; Simon, M. Ecotoxic effect of photocatalytic active nanoparticles (TiO₂) on
679 algae and daphnids. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. Int.* **2006**, 13 (4), 225–232.
- 680 (54) Amiano, I.; Olabarrieta, J.; Vitorica, J.; Zorita, S. Acute toxicity of nanosized TiO₂ to
681 *Daphnia magna* under UVA irradiation. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* **2012**, 31 (11), 2564–2566.
- 682 (55) Holden, P. A.; Gardea-Torresdey, J. L.; Klaessig, F.; Turco, R. F.; Mortimer, M.; Hund-
683 Rinke, K.; Cohen Hubal, E. A.; Avery, D.; Barceló, D.; Behra, R.; et al. Considerations of
684 Environmentally Relevant Test Conditions for Improved Evaluation of Ecological Hazards of
685 Engineered Nanomaterials. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2016**, 50 (12), 6124–6145.
- 686 (56) Mackevica, A.; Hansen, S. F. Release of nanomaterials from solid nanocomposites and
687 consumer exposure assessment – a forward-looking review. *Nanotoxicology* **2016**, 10(6),
688 641–653.
- 689 (57) Osmond-McLeod, M. J.; Oytam, Y.; Rowe, A.; Sobhanmanesh, F.; Greenoak, G.; Kirby, J.;
690 McInnes, E. F.; McCall, M. J. Long-term exposure to commercially available sunscreens
691 containing nanoparticles of TiO₂ and ZnO revealed no biological impact in a hairless mouse

- 692 model. *Part. Fibre Toxicol.* **2016**, 13 (1), 44.
- 693 (58) Wagener, S.; Dommershausen, N.; Jungnickel, H.; Laux, P.; Mitrano, D.; Nowack, B.;
694 Schneider, G.; Luch, A. Textile Functionalization and Its Effects on the Release of Silver
695 Nanoparticles into Artificial Sweat. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2016**, 50 (11), 5927–5934.
- 696 (59) Sijm, D. T. H. M.; Rikken, M. G. J.; Rorije, E.; Traas, T. P.; McLachlan, M. S.; Peijnenburg,
697 W. J. G. M. Transport, accumulation and transformation processes. In *Risk Assessment of*
698 *Chemicals: An Introduction*; van Leeuwen C. J., Vermeire T. G., Eds. Springer, Dordrecht,
699 NL, 2007. 73–158.
- 700 (60) Hankin, S.; Peters, S.; Poland, C.; Foss Hansen, S.; Holmqvist, J.; Ross, B. L.; Varet, J.;
701 Aitken, R. J. *Specific Advice on Fulfilling Information Requirements for Nanomaterials under*
702 *REACH*. RIP-oN 2; Final Project Report; European Commission, 2011.
- 703 (61) Briggs, G. G.; Bromilow, R. H.; Evans, A. A. Relationships between lipophilicity and root
704 uptake and translocation of non-ionised chemicals by barley. *Pestic. Sci.* **1982**, 13 (5), 495–
705 504.
- 706 (62) Trapp, S.; Matthies, M.; Scheunert, I.; Topp, E. M. Modeling the bioconcentration of organic
707 chemicals in plants. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **1990**, 24 (8), 1246–1252.
- 708 (63) Trapp, S.; Matthies, M. Generic one-compartment model for uptake of organic chemicals by
709 foliar vegetation. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **1995**, 29 (9), 2333–2338.
- 710 (64) Larsen, H. F.; Hauschild, M. Evaluation of ecotoxicity effect indicators for use in LCIA. *Int.*
711 *J. Life Cycle Assess.* **2007**, 12 (1), 24–33.
- 712 (65) Larsen, H. F.; Hauschild, M. Z. GM-troph: A Low data demand ecotoxicity effect indicator
713 for use in LCIA. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **2007**, 12 (2), 79–91.
- 714 (66) Laurent, A., Harkema, J., Andersen, E.W., Owsianiak, M., Veia, E.B., Jolliet, O. Human
715 health no-effect levels of TiO₂ nanoparticles as a function of their primary size. Accepted in *J.*
716 *Nanopart. Res.* (04/03/2017).
- 717 (67) Jovanović, B. Critical review of public health regulations of titanium dioxide, a human food
718 additive. *Integr. Environ. Assess. Manag.* **2015**, 11 (1), 10–20.
- 719 (68) Heinrich, U.; Fuhst, R.; Rittinghausen, S.; Creutzenberg, O.; Bellmann, B.; Koch, W.;
720 Levsen, K. Chronic inhalation exposure of Wistar rats and two different strains of mice to
721 diesel engine exhaust, carbon black, and titanium dioxide. *Inhal. Toxicol.* **1995**, 7 (4), 533–
722 556.
- 723 (69) Crettaz, P.; Pennington, D.; Rhomberg, L.; Brand, K.; Jolliet, O. Assessing Human Health
724 Response in Life Cycle Assessment Using ED10s and DALYs: Part 1 – Cancer Effects. *Risk*
725 *Anal.* **2002**, 22 (5), 931–946.

- 726 (70) Demou, E.; Peter, P.; Hellweg, S. Exposure to Manufactured Nanostructured Particles in an
727 Industrial Pilot Plant. *Ann. Occup. Hyg.* **2008**, 52 (8), 695–706.
- 728 (71) Koivisto, A. J.; Lyyr nen, J.; Auvinen, A.; Vanhala, E.; H meri, K.; Tuomi, T.; Jokiniemi, J.
729 Industrial worker exposure to airborne particles during the packing of pigment and nanoscale
730 titanium dioxide. *Inhal. Toxicol.* **2012**, 24 (12), 839–849.
- 731 (72) Johnston, B. D.; Scown, T. M.; Moger, J.; Cumberland, S. A.; Baalousha, M.; Linge, K.; van
732 Aerle, R.; Jarvis, K.; Lead, J. R.; Tyler, C. R. Bioavailability of nanoscale metal oxides TiO₂,
733 CeO₂, and ZnO to fish. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2010**, 44 (3), 1144–1151.
- 734 (73) Pavagadhi, S.; Sathishkumar, M.; Balasubramanian, R. Uptake of Ag and TiO₂ nanoparticles
735 by zebrafish embryos in the presence of other contaminants in the aquatic environment. *Water*
736 *Res.* **2014**, 55, 280–291.
- 737 (74) Federici, G.; Shaw, B. J.; Handy, R. D. Toxicity of titanium dioxide nanoparticles to rainbow
738 trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*): Gill injury, oxidative stress, and other physiological effects.
739 *Aquat. Toxicol.* **2007**, 84 (4), 415–430.
- 740 (75) Ramsden, C. S.; Smith, T. J.; Shaw, B. J.; Handy, R. D. Dietary exposure to titanium dioxide
741 nanoparticles in rainbow trout, (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*): No effect on growth, but subtle
742 biochemical disturbances in the brain. *Ecotoxicology* **2009**, 18 (7), 939–951.
- 743 (76) Al-Jubory, A. R.; Handy, R. D. Uptake of titanium from TiO₂ nanoparticle exposure in the
744 isolated perfused intestine of rainbow trout: nystatin, vanadate and novel CO₂-sensitive
745 components. *Nanotoxicology* **2012**, 7 (8), 1282–1301.
- 746 (77) Handy, R. D.; Cornelis, G.; Fernandes, T.; Tsyusko, O.; Decho, A.; Sabo-Attwood, T.;
747 Metcalfe, C.; Steevens, J. A.; Klaine, S. J.; Koelmans, A. A.; et al. Ecotoxicity test methods
748 for engineered nanomaterials: Practical experiences and recommendations from the bench.
749 *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* **2012**, 31 (1), 15–31.
- 750 (78) Yeo, M. K.; Nam, D. H. Influence of different types of nanomaterials on their
751 bioaccumulation in a paddy microcosm: A comparison of TiO₂ nanoparticles and nanotubes.
752 *Environ. Pollut.* **2013**, 178, 166–172.
- 753 (79) Zhu, X.; Chang, Y.; Chen, Y. Toxicity and bioaccumulation of TiO₂ nanoparticle aggregates
754 in *Daphnia magna*. *Chemosphere* **2010**, 78 (3), 209–215.
- 755 (80) Ma, X.; Gao, C. Uptake and accumulation of engineered nanomaterials and their
756 phytotoxicity to agricultural crops. In *Nanotechnologies in Food and Agriculture*; Rai, M.,
757 Ribeiro C., Mattoso L., Duran N. Springer, Heidelberg, DE, 2015, 321–342.
- 758 (81) Zhang, P.; Ma, Y.; Zhang, Z.; 2015. Interactions Between Engineered Nanomaterials and
759 Plants: Phytotoxicity, Uptake, Translocation, and Biotransformation. In: *Nanotechnology and*

- 760 *Plant Sciences - Nanoparticles and Their Impact on Plants*; Siddiqui M.H., Al-Whaibi M.H.,
761 Mohammad F., Eds. Springer, Heidelberg, DE, 2015, 77–99.
- 762 (82) Vittori-ntisari, L.; Carbone, S.; Gatti, A.; Vianello, G.; Nannipieri, P. Uptake and
763 translocation of metals and nutrients in tomato grown in soil polluted with metal oxide
764 (CeO₂, Fe₃O₄, SnO₂, TiO₂) or metallic (Ag, Co, Ni) engineered nanoparticles. *Environ. Sci.*
765 *Pollut. Res.* **2015**, 22 (3), 1841–1853.
- 766 (83) Larue, C.; Laurette, J.; Herlin-Boime, N.; Khodja, H.; Fayard, B.; Flank, A. M.; Brisset, F.;
767 Carriere, M. Accumulation, translocation and impact of TiO₂ nanoparticles in wheat
768 (*Triticum aestivum* spp.): Influence of diameter and crystal phase. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2012**,
769 431, 197–208.
- 770 (84) Larue, C.; Veronesi, G.; Flank, A.-M.; Surble, S.; Herlin-Boime, N.; Carrière, M.
771 Nanoparticles in wheat and rapeseed. *J. Toxicol. Environ. Heal. Part A* **2012**, 75 (13–15),
772 722–734.
- 773 (85) Rico, C. M.; Majumdar, S.; Duarte-Gardea, M.; Peralta-Videa, J. R.; Gardea-Torresdey, J. L.
774 Interaction of nanoparticles with edible plants and their possible implications in the food
775 chain. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* **2011**, 59, 3485–3498.
- 776 (86) Schwab, F.; Zhai, G.; Kern, M.; Turner, A.; Schnoor, J. L.; Wiesner, M. R. Barriers, pathways
777 and processes for uptake, translocation and accumulation of nanomaterials in plants - Critical
778 review. *Nanotoxicology* **2016**, 10 (3), 257–278.
- 779 (87) Dan, Y.; Zhang, W.; Xue, R.; Ma, X.; Stephan, C.; Shi, H. Characterization of gold
780 nanoparticle uptake by tomato plants using enzymatic extraction followed by single-particle
781 inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry analysis. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2015**, 49 (5),
782 3007–3014.
- 783 (88) Bradfield, S. J.; Kumar, P.; White, J. C.; Ebbs, S. D. Zinc, copper or cerium accumulation
784 from metal oxide nanoparticles or ions in sweet potato : Yield effects and projected dietary
785 intake from. *Plant Physiol. Biochem.* **2017**, 110, 128–137.
- 786 (89) Lützhøft H.-C. H.; Hartmann, N. B.; Brinch, A.; Kjølholt, J.; Baun, A. *Environmental effects*
787 *of engineered nanomaterials – Estimations of Predicted No-Effect Concentrations (PNECs)*.
788 Environmental project No. 1787. The Danish Environmental Protection Agency, Copenhagen,
789 DK, 2015.
- 790 (90) Lee, W. M.; An, Y. J. Effects of zinc oxide and titanium dioxide nanoparticles on green algae
791 under visible, UVA, and UVB irradiations: No evidence of enhanced algal toxicity under UV
792 pre-irradiation. *Chemosphere* **2013**, 91 (4), 536–544.
- 793 (91) Vicario-Parés, U.; Castañaga, L.; Lacave, J. M.; Oron, M.; Reip, P.; Berhanu, D.; Valsami-

- 794 Jones, E.; Cajaraville, M. P.; Orbea, A. Comparative toxicity of metal oxide nanoparticles
795 (CuO, ZnO and TiO₂) to developing zebrafish embryos. *J. Nanopart. Res.* **2014**, 16 (8), 2550.
- 796 (92) IARC. *Titanium dioxide. IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to*
797 *Humans*. IARC Monographs Volume 93. IARC, Lyon, FR, 2010.
- 798 (93) NIOSH. *Occupational Exposure to Titanium Dioxide*. Current Intelligence Bulletin 63.
799 DHHS (NIOSH) Publication No. 2011–160. Department of Health and Human Services,
800 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Institute for Occupational Safety and
801 Health: Atlanta, GA, USA, 2011.
- 802 (94) Clark, K.; van Tongeren, M.; Christensen, F. M.; Brouwer, D.; Nowack, B.; Gottschalk, F.;
803 Micheletti, C.; Schmid, K.; Gerritsen, R.; Aitken, R.; et al. Limitations and information needs
804 for engineered nanomaterial-specific exposure estimation and scenarios: recommendations for
805 improved reporting practices. *J. Nanoparticle Res.* **2012**, 14 (9), 1–14.
- 806 (95) Kühnel, D.; Busch, W.; Meißner, T.; Springer, A.; Potthoff, A.; Richter, V.; Gelinsky, M.;
807 Scholz, S.; Schirmer, K. Agglomeration of tungsten carbide nanoparticles in exposure
808 medium does not prevent uptake and toxicity toward a rainbow trout gill cell line. *Aquat.*
809 *Toxicol.* **2009**, 93 (2–3), 91–99.
- 810 (96) Patra, M.; Ma, X.; Isaacson, C.; Bouchard, D.; Poynton, H.; Lazorchak, J. M.; Rogers, K. R.
811 Changes in agglomeration of fullerenes during ingestion and excretion in *Thamnocephalus*
812 *platyurus*. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* **2011**, 30 (4), 828–835.
- 813 (97) Hartmann, N. B.; Engelbrekt, C.; Zhang, J.; Ulstrup, J.; Kusk, K. O.; Baun, A. The challenges
814 of testing metal and metal oxide nanoparticles in algal bioassays: titanium dioxide and gold
815 nanoparticles as case studies. *Nanotoxicology* **2012**, 7 (6), 1082–1094.
- 816 (98) Jacobs, R.; Meesters, J. A.; ter Braak, C. J. F.; van de Meent, D.; van der Voet, H. Combining
817 exposure and effect modelling into an integrated probabilistic environmental risk assessment
818 for nanoparticles. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* **2016**, 35 (12), 2958–2967.
- 819 (99) Griffitt, R. J.; Luo, J.; Gao, J.; Bonzongo, J.-C.; Barber, D. S. Effects of particle composition
820 and species on toxicity of metallic nanomaterials in aquatic organisms. *Environ. Toxicol.*
821 *Chem.* **2008**, 27 (9), 1972–1978.
- 822 (100) Christensen, F. M.; Johnston, H. J.; Stone, V.; Aitken, R. J.; Hankin, S.; Peters, S.;
823 Aschberger, K. Nano-silver - feasibility and challenges for human health risk assessment
824 based on open literature. *Nanotoxicology* **2010**, 4 (3), 284–295.
- 825 (101) Christensen, F. M.; Johnston, H. J.; Stone, V.; Aitken, R. J.; Hankin, S.; Peters, S.;
826 Aschberger, K. Nano-TiO₂-feasibility and challenges for human health risk assessment based
827 on open literature. *Nanotoxicology* **2011**, 5 (2), 110–124.

- 828 (102) Aschberger, K.; Micheletti, C.; Sokull-Klüttgen, B.; Christensen, F. M. Analysis of currently
829 available data for characterising the risk of engineered nanomaterials to the environment and
830 human health — Lessons learned from four case studies. *Environ. Int.* **2011**, 37 (6), 1143–
831 1156.
- 832 (103) OECD. *Report of the OECD Expert Meeting on the Physical Chemical Properties of*
833 *Manufactured Nanomaterials and Test Guidelines*. Series on the Safety of Manufactured
834 Nanomaterials No. 41. ENV/JM/MONO(2014)15. OECD, Paris, FR, 2014.